

Pamela Roach
SCRCOG Solid Waste and Recycling Consultant

February 26, 2023

Senator Rick Lopes and Representative Joseph P. Gresko, Co-Chairs
Senator Jan Hochadel and Representative Christine Palm Vice Chairs
Environment Committee
Legislative Office Building, Room 3200
Hartford, CT 06105

RE: Support for packaging EPR provisions of HB 6664, An Act Managing Waste and Creating a Waste Authority and Comments on Section 5: Universal Access to Source Separated Food Scraps

Dear Co-Chairs Lope and Gresko, Vice Chairs Hochadel and Palm, and Members of the Committee:

My name is Pamela Roach and I have been the Solid Waste and Recycling Consultant for SCRCOG since July of 2018.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit testimony in **support of the packing EPR provisions of HB 6664.**

CEO's, Public Works Directors and Solid Waste & Recycling professionals in Connecticut struggle with the rising costs to manage waste. EPR for packaging would relieve the financial burden of recycling the packaging chosen by brand owners.

It is estimated that Implementing EPR for packaging will provide significant financial relief for CT municipalities and taxpayers: **EPR for packaging can save an estimated \$50 million in recycling expenses by 2028 and reduce Connecticut's in-state waste capacity deficit by up to 190,000 tons each year which will aid CT in regaining "self-sufficiency" in Connecticut's waste management.**

Reports:

- In over 40 countries and provinces that have packaging EPR programs (some have been in place over 35 years) around the world have achieved recycling rates of over 70%. Connecticut's recycling rate was less than 30% in 2020.
- It is important to note that the US ranked 105 in the world in a report conducted by Yale Center for Environmental Law and Policy Yale which measured recycling rates in each country.

- The Recycling Partnership recently released a study supporting EPR for packaging and printed paper, saying such programs could create “nearly universal” recycling access, significantly boost residential rates and help create more sustainable funding sources for recycling programs.

Fact-Check - Packaging EPR does not raise prices for consumers: non-supporters of this bill will say that prices will increase for consumers. This was my concern as well until I learned that this is a misconception. A study conducted by Resource Recycling Systems and funded by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality analyzed consumer product prices before and after EPR legislation passed in Canada and found no evidence that they increased; in Europe, where the programs have been in operation for more than three decades, producers themselves report that prices have also remained stable.

I respectfully encourage the Committee to **report EPR for Packaging out favorably** as the facts above and those reported by my colleagues testifying in support today have been fact-checked through months of extensive research. EPR for packaging will ensure access to strong, consistent recycling programs and ensure all are educated on what and how to recycle properly.

Re: Section 5 universal access to source separated food scraps collection by requiring municipalities and haulers to provide those options by 2028. I am in full support of separating food for energy or compost as it will aid in reducing CT's in-state waste capacity deficit however municipalities will first need funding for infrastructure perhaps through DEEP's annual SMM grant and will need State permitting streamlined for businesses interested in providing local and regional infrastructure in CT. Design of this requirement will need ensure this is saving money for municipalities and not creating another financial burden.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at 203-804-0387.

Respectfully,



Pamela Roach, SCRCOG Solid Waste & Recycling Consultant
PDRicciRoach@gmail.com
Cell 203-804-0387